



**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
February 28, 2014 - 12:00 p.m. (NOON)
Manchester Meadows Conference Room**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Danny Funderburk; Brian Carnes; Ann Williamson; Doug Echols; Britt Blackwell; Kathy Pender; Bill Harris; Ralph Norman; W.B. Cook; and Michael Johnson

ADMINISTRATIVE / TECHNICAL / MANAGEMENT STAFF PRESENT: Greg Shaw (SCDOT); John McCarter (SCDOT); Robby Moody (CRCOG); Joy Shealy (SCDOT); Susan Britt (Tega Cay); Kevin Bronson (Rock Hill); Randall Young (SCDOT); Brian Klauk (SCDOT); Ryan Blancke (York County); Joe Cronin (Fort Mill); Bill Meyer (Rock Hill); Steve Allen (York County); Steve Willis (Lancaster County); Penelope Karagounis (Lancaster County); Phil Leazer (York County); David Vehaun (Rock Hill); Kevin Sheppard (SCDOT); David Burgess (SCDOT); Bill Jordan (SCDOT); Allison Love (York County); Elizabeth Harris (CIN); Chuck Chorak (Rock Hill); William Long (RFATS); and David Hooper (RFATS)

CITIZENS / VISITORS PRESENT: Carl Manns (CAC); Frank Myers (CAC); Jim Van Blarcom (CAC); Amy Massey (Kimley-Horn); Mike Fry (CAMPCO); Scot Sibert (STV, Inc.); John Delfausse (Indian Land); Jennifer Stalford (Tega Cay); and Larry Huntley (Fort Mill)

1. CALL TO ORDER:

a. Welcome – Chairman Blackwell called the meeting to order at 12:15 P.M. and welcomed all in attendance.

b. Citizen Comment Period – Dr. Blackwell asked if there were any citizen comments. There were no comments.

2. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Dr. Blackwell asked if there were any changes, deletions, or comments to the minutes of the January 28, 2014 meeting. Hearing no comments, Mr. Funderburk made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Harris seconded and the minutes were unanimously approved.

3. UPDATE ON CURRENT PROJECTS:

a. York County One-Cent Sales Tax – Mr. Leazer provided an update on the Pennies for Progress Program; specifically, SC 121 / Albright Road, McConnells Hwy (99% through ROW; bid for construction in June 2014; working around culverts will increase cost), Tega Cay-Gold Hill Road Connector (60% plans complete), Mt Gallant Road (ROW plans being updated), US 21 / SC 51 North (15% plans developed), Pole Branch Road /

SC 274 (15% plans developed), Gold Hill/I-77 (Interchange Modification Report submitted to SCDOT), Cel-River Road (ROW to be complete November 2014; large amount of utility relocation), SC 160 West, Riverview Road, Paraham Road (60% plans complete) and Fort Mill Southern Bypass (all phases are under various stages of implementation).

Mr. Leazer said that ROW for the Cel-River project will be an involved process. He said that there needs to be early coordination with SCDOT so that projects will not be delayed when ROW is complete. He noted that an optimistic timeframe for completion is late 2016 / early 2017.

4. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS:

- a. **Transportation Infrastructure Bank: Eligible RFATS Projects** – Mr. Leazer briefly reviewed the discussion at the January meeting on the history of the Transportation Infrastructure Bank (TIB) and York County’s past applications for the Dave Lyle Boulevard Extension Project in 1997, 2002, 2005, and 2011. Mr. Leazer then reviewed all the interchanges in the RFATS Area and summarized the relevant operating dynamics and area characteristics feeding into each location. Lastly, Mr. Leazer briefly summarized the area surrounding Exit 79 (Dave Lyle Blvd), and indicated that given the current and planned project activity (widening of Cel-River Road, build out and impact of Riverwalk, Galleria Mall Area, Springdale Road, and the Flyover Bridge) – could constitute a very strong TIB application.

Against this backdrop, Commissioner Cook then provided a summary of ACT 98 – which was approved in 2013, and specifically broke down each of the funding components provided through this provision. In particular, it was noted that of the \$141 million, \$50 million was dedicated to the TIB, but was directed by the legislature for projects in Greenville, Lexington, and Richland counties. Additionally, Mr. Cook said that all projects are required to be selected according to the Act 114 ranking process. Discussion then followed regarding Act 114 and the application process. Mr. Echols requested a list of where projects in the RFATS Study Area rank in Act 114.

- b. **East-West Connector Project: Coltharp Road Interchange Study** – Mr. Hooper reviewed the history of the Coltharp Road / I-77 interchange area as a part of the larger East-West Connector Project that was identified during the update to the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Hooper then reviewed recent discussions of the Technical Team about development activity along one stretch of a potential roadway alignment between SC 160 and the Coltharp Road / I-77 area.

In particular, Mr. Hooper mentioned the so-called “Brayden” development (roughly 440 residential units), which will include a combination of single-family, multi-family and a commercial component. Additionally, Mr. Hooper then mentioned the so-called “Habersham” development (approx. 200 residential units), that has received preliminary plat approval in an area central to where a proposed alignment was conceptually identified to connect into Coltharp Road.

Mr. Blackwell then asked about the land located within the Nations Ford Land Trust along the conceptual path of a new roadway? As a point of reference, Mr. Hooper noted that this land was placed into the Land Trust back in 2007, and that construction of a road was probably not envisioned at that time. Ms. Britt then indicated that it is her

understanding that the nature of the conservation easement does not preclude a road from being constructed, provided that sufficient protections are maintained – but that the construction of something more significant like an interchange could not be routed through it. Mr. Allen then reviewed the inventory of wetlands and noted that a lot of wetlands and streams that aren't necessarily reflected in the official inventory are nonetheless a planning variable in this area.

Mr. Norman then asked a broader question about why RFATS would undertake such a study when the likelihood of getting the East-West Connector Project funded appears well beyond RFATS' resources? In response, Mr. Hooper reviewed the Policy Committee's prior discussions about all the component parts of the project, and the general sense of the Policy Committee was that this is a very big project, and the first step was to focus on the feasibility study to see if a new interchange was workable, and then come back and look at the funding question of the different component parts of the project.

Mr. Blackwell then asked a follow-up question about the development impact in the area? In response, Mr. Allen noted that the area was zoned for residential prior to the identification of this project (which is fairly new); and that, although a preservation ordinance is in place for Pennies Projects, it is not present for other projects that may have been identified, but have not been incorporated into any other plans that staff can utilize during the development review process. Mr. Blackwell then noted that there are environmental constraints on one side of the SC 160 / Coltharp Road area, and development related constraints on the other; and then asked whether anyone saw a reason to move forward with the interchange study. Mr. Norman stated that he did not see the basis for proceeding given what has been discussed today.

Mr. Johnson then noted that he too sees the difficulty of moving forward with a new roadway component between SC 160 and Coltharp Road, but that the basis of studying a new interchange should remain a priority given the development pressures on the east side of I-77; specifically, Mr. Johnson noted the expected impact of development along US 21 – and what can be built between SC 160 and Coltharp Road could significantly added to area traffic congestion. Notwithstanding the points made about evaluating a new interchange, Ms. Pender then stated that dispensing with the other component parts of the East – West Connector Project (i.e., a new bridge over the Catawba River), still leaves unresolved how to correct the dysfunctionality of the Celanese Corridor and the central role it serves in the regional transportation system?

Mr. Johnson mentioned that he has contacted county staff about the need to establish a preservation ordinance for new roadways (in addition to those funded through Pennies), as well as the need to have money set aside to buy right-of-way so that longer term planning efforts can be effectively implemented. Lastly, Mr. Johnson stated his hope that other jurisdictions, particularly Tega Cay and Fort Mill would embrace such an approach going forward.

5. PROPOSED POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Title VI Plan: Approval of draft plan** – Mr. Long summarized the development of the MPO Title VI Program. He noted that all activities and efforts included have always been undertaken as a part of the Public Participation Plan, but that FHWA has requested the establishment of a separate stand-alone document focusing on this part of the transportation planning process. Mr. Long then asked the Policy Committee to grant

preliminary approval to the Title VI Program, as well as authorization of a 15-day public comment period. Dr. Blackwell asked for a motion. Mr. Echols made a motion to approve the Title VI Program and public comment period; Mr. Funderburk seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

6. OTHER BUSINESS:

- a. Administrative Report** – Mr. Hooper presented the Administrative Report, and specifically noted that staff has received an initial indication of projected adjustment to our Guideshare funding as a result of the 2010 Census and related boundary adjustment. Mr. Hooper then mentioned that although discussions remain active at SCDOT – that two scenarios are being considered that would impact RFATS Annual Guideshare funding as follows:

Option A – The current Guideshare formula with updated vehicle miles traveled and urbanized population data, would increase RFATS Annual Guideshare Allocation by \$1,677,127.00. This would increase funding through the existing 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan by roughly \$33,542,540.00 (i.e., \$26,834,023 in new funding and \$6,708,508 for meeting the new 20% road resurfacing / intersection improvement requirement.

Option B – The alternate proposal (i.e., focusing on urban area population and excluding vehicle miles traveled), would increase RFATS Annual Guideshare Allocation by \$1,941,531.00. This would increase funding of the current LRTP by approximately \$38,830,620.00 (i.e., \$31,064,496.00 / \$7,766,124.00).

- b. CATS Plaza Fiesta Park-and-Ride** – Mr. Norman thanked Mr. Hooper for his efforts to assist riders in Fort Mill with the proposed change at the existing park-n-ride lot at Plaza Fiesta.
- c. Next Regular Meeting** – Dr. Blackwell announced that the next regular meeting will be held on Friday, March 28, 2014 at the Manchester Meadows Conference Room.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:40 P.M.